arXiv:1301.2005v2 [cs.AI] 23 Jan 2013

A Distance-based Paraconsistent Semantics in DL-Lite

Xiaowang Zhang[1], Kewen Wang[2], Zhe Wang[3], Yue Ma[4], and Guilin Qi[5]

[1]Hasselt University and transnational University of Limburg, Belgium
[2]Griffith University, Australia
[3]University of Oxford, United Kingdom
[4]Technische Universität Dresden, Germany
[5]Southeast University, China

Abstract. DL-Lite is an important family of description logics. Recently, there is an increasing interest in handling inconsistency in DL-Lite as the constraint imposed by a TBox can be easily violated by assertions in ABox in DL-Lite. In this paper, we present a distance-based paraconsistent semantics based on the notion of feature in DL-Lite, which provides a novel way to rationally draw meaningful conclusions even from an inconsistent knowledge base. Finally, we investigate several important logical properties of this entailment relation based on the new semantics and show its promising advantages in non-monotonic reasoning for DL-Lite.

1 Introduction

The DL-Lite [1] is a family of lightweight description logics (DLs), the logical foundation of OWL 2.0 QL, one of the three profiles of OWL 2.0 for Web ontology language recommended by W3C. In description logics, an ontology is expressed as a knowledge base (KB). Inconsistency is not rare in ontology applications and may be caused by several reasons, such as errors in modeling, migration from other formalisms, ontology merging, and ontology evolution. Therefore, handling inconsistency is always considered an important problem in DL and ontology management communities. However, DL-Lite reasoning mechanism based on classical DL semantics faces problem when inconsistency occurs, which is referred to as the triviality problem. That is, any conclusions, that are possibly irrelevant or even contradicting, will be entailed from an inconsistent DL-Lite ontology under the classical semantics.

In many practical ontology applications, there is a strong need for inferring (only) useful information from inconsistent ontologies. For instance, consider a simple DL-Lite KB $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{T} = \{Penguin \sqsubseteq Bird, Swallow \sqsubseteq Bird, Bird \sqsubseteq Fly\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{Penguin(tweety), \neg Fly(tweety), Swallow(fred)\}$. Under the classical semantics for DLs, anything can be inferred from $\mathcal{K}$. Intuitively, one might wish to still infer $Brid(fred)$ and $Fly(fred)$, while they are useless to derive both $Fly(tweety)$ and $\neg Fly(tweety)$ from $\mathcal{K}$.

There exist several proposals for reasoning with inconsistent DL-Lite KBs in the literature. These approaches usually fall into one of two fundamentally different streams. The first one is based on the assumption that inconsistencies are caused by erroneous data and thus, they should be removed in order to obtain a consistent KB ([2,3,4,5]).

In most approaches in this stream, the task of repairing inconsistent ontologies is actually reduced to finding a maximum consistent subset of the original KB. A shortcoming of these approaches is the so-called *multi-extension problem*. That is, in many cases, an inconsistent KB may have several different sub-KBs that are maximum consistent. The other stream, based on the idea of living with inconsistency, is to introduce a form of paraconsistent reasoning or inconsistency-tolerant reasoning by employing non-standard reasoning methods (e.g., non-standard inference and non-classical semantics). [7,8] introduce some strategies to select consistent subsets from an inconsistent KB as substitutes of the original KB in reasoning. [11] present the Belnap's four-valued semantics of DLs where two additional logical values besides "true" and "false" are introduced to indicate contradictory conclusions. [12] present the Hunter's quasi-classical semantics of DLs whose strong semantics strengthens the inference power of four-valued semantics. However, the reasoning capability of such paraconsistent methods is not strong enough for many practical applications. For instance, a conclusion ϕ, that can inferred from a consistent KB $\mathcal{K}$ under the classical semantics, may become not derivable under their paraconsistent semantics. We argue that approaches in these two streams are mostly *coarse-grained* in the sense that they fail to fully utilize semantic information in the given inconsistent KB. For instance, when two interpretations make a concept unsatisfiable, one interpretation may be more reasonable than the other. But existing approaches to paraconsistent semantics in DLs do not take this into account usually.

Recently a distance-based semantics presented by [14] has been proposed to deal with inconsistent KBs in propositional logic. However, it is not straightforward to generalize this approach to DLs because a DL KB can have infinite number of models and a model can also be infinite. Additionally, it is also a challenge in adopting distance-based semantics for DL complex constructors.

To overcome these difficulties, in this paper we first use the notion of *features* [15] and introduce a distance-based semantics for paraconsistent reasoning with DL-Lite. Feature in DL-Lite are Herbrand interpretations extended with limited structure, which provide a novel semantic characterization for DLs. In addition, features also generalize the notion of *types* for TBoxes [16] to general KBs. Each KB in DL-Lite has a finite number of features and each feature is finite. This makes it possible to cast Arieli's distance-based semantics to DL-Lite.

The main innovations and contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows. We introduce distances on *types* of DL-Lite$_{bool}^{\mathcal{N}}$ KBs, which avoids the problem of domain infiniteness and model infiniteness in defining the distance in terms of models of KBs. Based on the new distance on types, we develop a way of measuring types that are closest to a TBox and the notion of *minimal model types* is introduced. This notion is also extended to *minimal model features* for KBs. We propose a distance-based semantics for DL-Lite$_{bool}^{\mathcal{N}}$ so that useful information can still be inferred when a KB is inconsistent. This is accomplished by introducing a novel entailment relation (i.e. distance-based entailment) between a KB and an axiom in terms of minimal model features. Our results show that the distance-based entailment is paraconsistent, non-monotonic, cautious as the paraconsistent based on multi-valued semantics. We also show that the distance-based entailment is not over-skeptical in the sense that for a classically consistent KB, the distance-based entailment coincides with the classical entailment, which is missing in most existing paraconsistent semantics for DLs.

2 The DL-Lite Family and Features

A *signature* is a finite set $\Sigma = \Sigma_A \cup \Sigma_R \cup \Sigma_I \cup \Sigma_N$ where Σ_A is the set of atomic concepts, Σ_R the set of atomic roles, Σ_I the set of individual names (or, objects) and Σ_N the set of natural numbers in Σ. We use capital letters A, B, C (with subscripts C_1, C_2) to denote concept names, P, R, S (with subscripts P_1, P_2) to denote role names, lowercase letters a, b, c to denote individual names and assume 1 is always in Σ_N. $\top$ and $\bot$ will not be considered as concept names or role names.

Formally, given a signature Σ, the DL-Lite$^{\mathcal{N}}_{bool}$ language is inductively constructed by syntax rules: **r1**: $R \leftarrow P \mid P^-$, **r1**: $B \leftarrow \top \mid A \mid \geq nR$, **r3**: $C \leftarrow B \mid \neg C \mid C_1 \sqcap C_2$. We say B a *basic concept* and C a *general concept*. Other standard concept constructs such as $\bot$, $\exists R$, $\leq nR$ and $C_1 \cup C_2$ can be introduced as abbreviations: $\bot$ for $\neg\top$, $\exists R$ for $\geq 1R$, $\leq nR$ for $\neg(\geq (n+1)R)$ and $C_1 \sqcup C_2$ for $\neg(\neg C_1 \sqcap \neg C_2)$. For any $P \in \Sigma_R$, $P^{--} = P$.

A TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite set of *(concept) inclusions* of the form $C_1 \sqsubseteq C_2$ where C_1 and C_2 are general concepts. An ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite set of concept assertions $C(a)$ and role assertions $R(a, b)$. Concept inclusions, concept assertions and role assertions are axioms. A KB is composed of a TBox and an ABox, written by $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$. $Sig(\mathcal{K})$ denotes the signature of $\mathcal{K}$.

An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is a pair $\langle \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}} \rangle$, where $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a non-empty set called the *domain* and $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}}$ is an interpretation function such that $a^{\mathcal{I}} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, $A^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $P^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. General concepts are interpreted as follows: $(P^-)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a^{\mathcal{I}}, b^{\mathcal{I}}) \mid (b^{\mathcal{I}}, a^{\mathcal{I}}) \in P^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, $(\geq nR)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a^{\mathcal{I}} \mid |\{b^{\mathcal{I}} \mid (a^{\mathcal{I}}, b^{\mathcal{I}}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}\}| \geq n\}$, $(\neg C)^{\mathcal{I}} = \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus C^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $(C_1 \sqcap C_2)^{\mathcal{I}} = C_1^{\mathcal{I}} \cap C_2^{\mathcal{I}}$. The definition of interpretation is based on the *unique name assumption* (UNA), i.e., $a^{\mathcal{I}} \neq b^{\mathcal{I}}$ for two different individual names a and b.

An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is a *model* of a concept inclusion $C_1 \sqsubseteq C_2$ (a concept assertion $C(a)$, or a role assertion $R(a, b)$) if $C_1^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq C_2^{\mathcal{I}}$ ($a^{\mathcal{I}} \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$, or $(a^{\mathcal{I}}, b^{\mathcal{I}}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$); and $\mathcal{I}$ is called a *model* of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ (an ABox $\mathcal{A}$) if $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of each inclusion of $\mathcal{T}$ (each assertion of $\mathcal{A}$). $\mathcal{I}$ is called a *model* of a KB $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ if $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of both $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. We use $Mod(\mathcal{K})$ to denote the set of models of $\mathcal{K}$. A KB $\mathcal{K}$ *entails* an axiom ϕ, if $Mod(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq Mod(\{\phi\})$. Two KBs $\mathcal{K}_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_2$ are *equivalent* if $Mod(\mathcal{K}_1) = Mod(\mathcal{K}_2)$, denoted by $\mathcal{K}_1 \equiv \mathcal{K}_2$. A KB $\mathcal{K}$ is *consistent* if it has at least one mode, *inconsistent* otherwise.

As we all known, models of a KB are often infinite and the number of models of a KB is possibly infinite. To characterize infinite models in a finite expression, two important notions, namely, type and feature, are respectively defined by [16] and [15] for TBoxes and general KBs in DL-Lite.

Let Σ be a signature. A *Σ-type* (or simply a *type*) is a set of basic concepts over Σ, s.t., $\top \in \tau$, and for any $m, n \in \Sigma_N$ with $m < n$, $R \in \Sigma_R \cup \{P^- \mid P \in \Sigma_R\}$, $\geq nR \in \tau$ implies $\geq mR \in \tau$. As $\top \in \tau$ for any type τ, we omit it in examples for simplicity. T_Σ denotes the set of all Σ-types. Note that if $\exists P$ (or $\exists P^-$) occurs in a general concept C then $\exists P^-$ (or $\exists P$) should be also considered as a new concept independent of $\exists P$

(or $\exists P^-$) in computing types of C respectively. We say a *type set* as a set of types $\{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_m\}$, denoted as Ξ and a *type group* as a set of type sets $\{\Xi_1, \ldots, \Xi_n\}$, denoted as Π. Then we denote $\cup\Xi = \tau_1 \cup \cdots \cup \tau_m$ and $\cap\Pi = \Xi_1 \cap \ldots \cap \Xi_n$. A type τ *satisfies* a basic concept B if $B \in \tau$, τ satisfies $\neg C$ if τ does not satisfy C, and τ satisfies $C_1 \sqcap C_2$ if τ satisfies both C_1 and C_2. $T_\Sigma(C)$ denotes a collection of all Σ-types of C. In this way, each general concept C over Σ corresponds to a set $T_\Sigma(C)$ of all Σ-types satisfying C. τ *satisfies* a concept inclusion $C \sqsubseteq D$ if $\tau \in T_\Sigma(\neg C \sqcup D)$. And τ is a *model type* a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ iff it satisfies each inclusion in $\mathcal{T}$. *Model type sets* and *model type groups* are analogously defined. If Ξ is a model type set of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ then $\exists P \in \cup\Xi$ iff $\exists P^- \in \cup\Xi$. This property is called *role coherence* which can be used to check whether a type set is the model type set of some TBox. $\Pi_\Sigma(\mathcal{T})$ denotes the model type group $\{T_\Sigma(\neg C_1 \sqcup D_1), \ldots, T_\Sigma(\neg C_n \sqcup D_n)\}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ where $\mathcal{T} = \{C_1 \sqsubseteq D_1, \ldots, C_n \sqsubseteq D_n\}$ is a TBox over Σ. It appears that $\cap\Pi_\Sigma(\mathcal{T})$ is the collection of model Σ-types of $\mathcal{T}$.

A Σ-*Herbrand set* (or simply *Herbrand set*) $\mathcal{H}$ is a finite set of member assertions satisfying: (1) for each $a \in \Sigma_I$, if $B_1(a), \ldots, B_k(a)$, where $\{B_1, \ldots, B_k\} \subseteq \Sigma_B$ are all the concept assertions about a in $\mathcal{H}$, then the set $\{B_1, \ldots, B_k\}$ is a Σ-type; (2) for each $P \in \Sigma_R$, if $P(a, b_i)(1 \leq i \leq n)$ are all the role assertions about a in $\mathcal{H}$, then for any $m \in \Sigma_N$ with $m \leq n$, $(\geq mP)(a)$ is in $\mathcal{H}$; (3) for each $P \in \Sigma_R$, if $P(b_i, a)(1 \leq i \leq n)$ are all the role assertions in $\mathcal{H}$, then for any $m \in \Sigma_N$ with $m \leq n$, $(\geq mP^-)(a)$ is in $\mathcal{H}$. We simply write $\tau(a) = \{B_1(a), \ldots, B_k(a)\}$ where $\tau = \{B_1, \ldots, B_k\}$. Moreover, given a set of types $\Xi = \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_m\}$, $\Xi(a)$ denotes $\{\tau_1(a), \ldots, \tau_m(a)\}$ without confusion. In this case, we say $\tau(a)$ is in $\mathcal{H}$ if $\{B_1(a), \ldots, B_k(a)\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. A Herbrand set $\mathcal{H}$ *satisfies* a concept assertion $C(a)$ (a role assertion $P(a, b)$ or $P^-(b, a)$) if $\tau(a)$ is in $\mathcal{H}$ and $\tau \in T_\Sigma(C)$ ($P(a, b) \in \mathcal{H}$ or $P^-(b, a) \in \mathcal{H}$). A Herbrand set $\mathcal{H}$ *satisfies* an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ if $\mathcal{H}$ satisfies all assertions in $\mathcal{A}$.

A Σ-*feature* (or simply a *feature*) $\mathcal{F}$ is a pair $\langle \Xi, \mathcal{H} \rangle$, where Ξ is a non-empty set of Σ-types and $\mathcal{H}$ a Σ-Herbrand set, if $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies: (1) for each $P \in \Sigma_R$, $\exists P \in \bigcup \Xi$ iff $\exists P^- \in \bigcup \Xi$ (i.e., Ξ holds role coherence); and (2) for each $a \in \Sigma_I$ and $\tau(a)$ in $\mathcal{H}$, s.t., τ is a Σ-type, $\tau \in \Xi$. A feature $\mathcal{F}$ *satisfies* an inclusion $C_1 \sqsubseteq C_2$ over Σ, if $\Xi \subseteq T_\Sigma(\neg C_1 \sqcup C_2)$; $\mathcal{F}$ *satisfies* a concept assertion $C(a)$ over Σ, if $\tau(a) \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\tau \in T_\Sigma(C)$; and $\mathcal{F}$ *satisfies* a role assertion $P(a, b)$ (resp., $P^-(b, a)$) over Σ, if $P(a, b) \in \mathcal{H}$. A feature $\mathcal{F}$ is a *model feature* of KB $\mathcal{K}$ if $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies each inclusion and each assertion in $\mathcal{K}$. $Mod^F(\mathcal{K})$ denotes the set of all model features of $\mathcal{K}$. It easily concludes that $\mathcal{K}$ is consistent iff $Mod^F(\mathcal{K}) \neq \emptyset$. Given two KBs $\mathcal{K}_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_2$, let $\Sigma = Sig(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2)$, $\mathcal{K}_1$ *F-entails* $\mathcal{K}_2$ if $Mod^F(\mathcal{K}_1) \subseteq Mod^F(\mathcal{K}_2)$, written by $\mathcal{K} \models^F \mathcal{K}_2$; and $\mathcal{K}_1$ is *F-equivalent* $\mathcal{K}_2$ if $Mod^F(\mathcal{K}_1) = Mod^F(\mathcal{K}_2)$, written by $\mathcal{K} \equiv^F \mathcal{K}_2$. [15] conclude that: *(1)* $\mathcal{K}_1 \models \mathcal{K}_2$ iff $\mathcal{K}_1 \models^F \mathcal{K}_2$; *(2)* $\mathcal{K}_1 \equiv \mathcal{K}_2$ iff $\mathcal{K}_1 \equiv^F \mathcal{K}_2$. Intuitively, F-entailment relation is equal to classical entailment relation. In the remainder of this paper, we directly use $\models$ to express F-entailment relation ($\models^F$).

3 Distance-based Semantics for TBoxes

In this section, we introduce distances between types of TBoxes.

Definition 1 (Type Distance) *Let Σ be a signature, a total function $d : T_\Sigma \times T_\Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ is a* pseudo-distance *(for short,* distance*) on T_Σ if it satisfies: (1) $\forall \tau_1, \tau_2 \in T_\Sigma, d(\tau_1, \tau_2) = 0$ iff $\tau_1 = \tau_2$; and (2) $\forall \tau_1, \tau_2 \in T_\Sigma, d(\tau_1, \tau_2) = d(\tau_2, \tau_1)$.*

Given a type $\tau \in T_\Sigma$ and a type set $\Xi \subseteq T_\Sigma$, the distance between τ and Ξ is defined as $d(\tau, \Xi) = min\{d(\tau, \tau') \mid \tau' \in \Xi\}$.

If $\Xi = \emptyset$, then we set $d(\tau, \Xi) = \mathbf{d}$ where $\mathbf{d}$ is a default value of distance greater than any value be to considered.

There are two representative distance functions on types, namely, *Hamming distance* where $d^H(\tau_1, \tau_2) = |(\tau_1 - \tau_2) \cup (\tau_2 - \tau_1)|$ and *drastic distance* where $d^D(\tau_1, \tau_2) = 0$ if $\tau_1 = \tau_2$ and $d^D(\tau_1, \tau_2) = 1$ otherwise.

An *aggregation function* f is a total function that accepts a multi-set of real numbers and returns a real number, satisfying: (1) f is non-decreasing in the values of its argument; (2) $f(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) = 0$ iff $x_1 = \ldots = x_n = 0$; and (3) $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $f(\{x\}) = x$. There exist some popular aggregation functions (see [18]):

- The *summation* function: $f^s(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \sum_{1 \le i \le n} x_i$;
- The *maximun* function: $f^m(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = max_{1 \le i \le n} x_i$;
- The κ-*voting* function ($0 < \kappa < 1$): $f^\kappa(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0$ if $Zero(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) = n$; $f^\kappa(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \frac{1}{2}$ if $\lceil \kappa \cdot n \rceil \le Zero(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) < n$ and $f^\kappa(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 1$ otherwise, where $Zero(\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\})$ is the number of zeros in $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. κ is called the *voting index* of f^κ.

Using aggregation functions, the distance between two types can be extended to a type and a type group.

Definition 2 (Minimal Type) *Let Σ be a signature, τ a type and $\Pi = \{\Xi_1, \ldots, \Xi_n\}$ a type group. Given d and f, the distance $\lambda_{d,f}$ between τ and Π is defined as $\lambda_{d,f}(\tau, \Pi) = f(\{d(\tau, \Xi_1), \ldots, d(\tau, \Xi_n)\})$. Furthermore, τ is called df-*minimal *(for short,* minimal*) w.r.t. Π if for any $\tau' \in T_\Sigma$, $\lambda_{d,f}(\tau, \Pi) \le \lambda_{d,f}(\tau', \Pi)$. Given a type set Ξ. $\Lambda_{d,f}(\Pi, \Xi)$ denotes a set of all df-minimal types w.r.t. Π in Ξ.*

First, minimal types have the following simple properties.

Proposition 1 *Let Σ be a signature and $\Pi = \{\Xi_1, \ldots, \Xi_n\}$ a type group. For any d and f, we have*

- *If $\Xi_i \neq \emptyset$ for some i ($1 \le i \le n$), then $\Lambda_{d,f}(\Pi, T_\Sigma) \neq \emptyset$;*
- *If $\cap \Pi \neq \emptyset$, then $\Lambda_{d,f}(\Pi, T_\Sigma) = \cap \Pi$.*

The first statement guarantees that if a type group contains a non-empty type set then a minimal type of it always exists and the second shows that each type belong to all members of a type group is exactly a minimal type.

Let Σ be a signature and $\mathcal{T} = \{\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n\}$ a TBox over Σ. Each axiom ψ_i is of the form $C_i \sqsubseteq D_i (1 \le i \le n)$ where C_i, D_i ($1 \le i \le n$) are concepts. We simply write $\Pi_\Sigma(\mathcal{T})$ as $\Pi(\mathcal{T})$ instead of if $\Sigma = Sig(\mathcal{T})$. Thus we conclude that Proposition 1 holds in TBoxes.

Corollary 1 *Let Σ be a signature and $\mathcal{T}$ a TBox over Σ. For any d and f, we have*

- $\Lambda_{d,f}(\Pi_\Sigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma) \neq \emptyset$;
- *if* $\mathcal{T}$ *is consistent then* $\Lambda_{d,f}(\Pi_\Sigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma) = \cap \Pi_\Sigma(\mathcal{T})$.

The above second result is not true if $\mathcal{T}$ is inconsistent.

Example 1 *Let* $\mathcal{T} = \{\top \sqsubseteq A, A \sqsubseteq \exists P, \exists P \sqsubseteq \bot\}$ *is a TBox and* $\Sigma = Sig(\mathcal{T})$ *a signature. Assume that* d *is the Hamming distance and* f *is the summation function. So* $\Sigma = \{A, P\}$ *and* $\mathcal{T}$ *is inconsistent.* $\mathcal{T}$ *has eight possible types:* $\tau_{11} = \{\}$, $\tau_{12} = \{\exists P^-\}$, $\tau_{21} = \{\exists P\}$, $\tau_{22} = \{\exists P, \exists P^-\}$, $\tau_{31} = \{A\}$, $\tau_{32} = \{A, \exists P^-\}$, $\tau_{41} = \{A, \exists P\}$ *and* $\tau_{41} = \{A, \exists P, \exists P^-\}$. *Thus,* $\cap \Pi(\mathcal{T}) = \emptyset$ *while* $\Lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma) = \{\tau_{11}, \tau_{12}, \tau_{31}, \tau_{32}, \tau_{41}, \tau_{42}\}$.

Unfortunately, $\Lambda_{d,f}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma)$ does not always satisfy the role coherence as the following example shows.

Example 2 *Let* $\mathcal{T} = \{\top \sqsubseteq A \sqcap \exists P, \exists P^- \sqsubseteq \bot\}$ *and* $\Sigma = Sig(\mathcal{T})$. *If* d *is the Hamming distance and* f *is the summation function, then* $\Lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma) = \{\{A, \exists P\}\}$. *We note that* $\exists P^- \not\in \cup \Lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma)$.

The reason that the role coherence might be absent in $\Lambda_{d,f}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma)$ is that $\exists P$ and $\exists P^-$ are taken as two independent concepts so that the relation of satisfiability between $\exists P$ and $\exists P^-$ can not be captured when minimal types are computed. In other words, given an arbitrary type set, there is not always a TBox such that it is a model type set of the TBox (see [16]).

Given an arbitrary type set Ξ, if it is not a model type set of any TBox, there are two possible options to recovery the role coherence. For instance, if $\tau \in \Xi$ such that $\exists R \in \tau$ and $\exists R^- \not\in \cup \Xi$ for some role R, then we can either remove τ from Ξ or add a new type τ such that $\exists R^- \in \tau$ in to Ξ. In Example 2, if we remove the type $\{A, \exists P\}$, then $\Lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma)$ will be empty, which is not desirable. So we will extend the type violating the role coherence. Consider Example 2 again, there are three possible types $\tau_1 = \{\exists P^-\}, \tau_2 = \{A, \exists P^-\}$ and $\tau_3 = \{A, \exists P, \exists P^-\}$ such that $\exists P^- \in \tau_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) where $\lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\tau_1, \Pi(\mathcal{T})) = 3$, $\lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\tau_2, \Pi(\mathcal{T})) = 2$ and $\lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\tau_3, \Pi(\mathcal{T})) = 1$. So we can pick τ_3 as the desired minimal type. Furthermore, this extension is an iterative process since newly added types possibly contains new role names and role incoherence is not yet satisfied at every step. To construct a model type set of from a random type set Ξ, we introduce an iterative operator $\mu_{d,f}(\Xi)$ and its fixpoint written by $FP(\mu_{d,f})$.

Formally, let Σ be a signature and Π a type group, given a type set Ξ, Let $\mu_{d,f}(\Xi) = \Xi \cup \Xi'$, where $\Xi' \subseteq T_\Sigma$ and $\Xi' = \{\tau \mid$ for some R, $\exists R \in \cup \Xi$ and $\exists R^- \not\in \cup \Xi$, $\exists R^- \in \tau$ and for any $\tau' \in T_\Sigma$, $\exists R^- \in \tau'$ implies $\lambda_{d,f}(\tau, \Pi) \leq \lambda_{d,f}(\tau', \Pi)\}$. We use Ξ^+ to denote the *fixpoint* of $\mu_{d,f}$, i.e., $\Xi^+ = FP(\mu_{d,f})$. For any d, f, and Ξ, Ξ^+ always exists since $\mu_{d,f}$ is inflationary (i.e., $\Xi \subseteq \mu_{d,f}(\Xi)$) and monotonic (i.e., $\mu_{d,f}(\Xi_1) \subseteq \mu_{d,f}(\Xi_2)$ if $\Xi_1 \subseteq \Xi_2$).

Given a signature Σ and a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ over Σ, we say $\Lambda^+_{d,f}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma)$ is the *minimal model type set* of $\mathcal{T}$. Intuitively speaking, a minimal model type set is a set of minimal types with maintaining role coherence. In Example 2, $\Lambda^+_{d^H,f^s}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma)$ = $\Lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\Pi(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma) \cup \{\tau_3\}$ = $\{\{A, \exists P\}, \{A, \exists P, \exists P^-\}\}$.

We show that minimal model type sets meet our motivation.

Proposition 2 *Let Σ be a signature and $\mathcal{T}$ a TBox over Σ. For any d and f, we have*

- $\Lambda^{+}_{d,f}(\Pi_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{T}), T_{\Sigma}) \neq \emptyset$;
- $\Lambda^{+}_{d,f}(\Pi_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{T}), T_{\Sigma}) = \cap \Pi_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{T})$, *if $\mathcal{T}$ is consistent;*
- $\exists P \in \cup \Lambda^{+}_{d,f}(\Pi_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{T}), T_{\Sigma})$ *iff* $\exists P^{-} \in \cup \Lambda^{+}_{d,f}(\Pi_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{T}), T_{\Sigma})$ *for any $P \in \Sigma_R$.*

The first result states that there always exist minimal model types for any non-empty TBox; the second shows that when a TBox is consistent, each minimal model type is exactly model type; and the third ensures that minimal model type sets always hold role coherence.

Definition 3 (TBox Distance-based Entailment) *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a TBox and ϕ an inclusion. Assume $\Sigma = Sig(\mathcal{T} \cup \{\psi\})$ be a signature. Given d and f, $\mathcal{T}$ distance-based entails (d-entails) ψ, denoted by $\mathcal{T} \models_{d,f} \psi$, if $\Lambda^{+}_{d,f}(\Pi_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{T}), T_{\Sigma}) \subseteq Mod^{T}(\{\psi\})$.*

In Example 1, $\mathcal{T} \not\models_{d^H,f^s} A \sqsubseteq \exists P$ and in Example 2, $\mathcal{T} \models_{d^H,f^s} \top \sqsubseteq A$. Additionally, contradiction $\top \sqsubseteq \bot$ can not be d-entailed by any TBox $\mathcal{T}$.

4 Distance-based Semantics for Knowledge Bases

This section define minimal model features of KBs. Compared with inconsistency of TBoxes, inconsistency occurring in KBs is complicated since it contains two extra cases: inconsistency of ABoxes and inconsistency between TBoxes and ABoxes. In more detail, these inconsistencies occur in among concept assertions, between concept assertions and role assertions, between assertions and inclusions, even between a single inclusion and a single assertion. For instance,

Example 3 *Let $\mathcal{K} = (\{\exists P^{-} \sqsubseteq \bot\}, \{\exists P(a)\})$ be a KB* (see [15]) *and $\Sigma = \{P, a, 1\}$. It concludes that $\mathcal{K}$ is inconsistent and thus has no model feature, i.e., $Mod^{F}(\mathcal{K}) = \emptyset$.*

To deal with those various inconsistencies in a unified way, we adopt the technique of computing minimal model types to construct minimal model features instead of directly introducing distance over features. We argue that this adoption can not only uniformly deal with all inconsistencies but also overcome difficulty of defining distance over pairs of features (see [15]).

We first introduce *concept profiles* to use type distance can describe how far apart features are. Let Σ be a signature and $\mathcal{A}$ an ABox over Σ. Assume that N_A a set of all named individuals in $\mathcal{A}$. $\mathcal{A}_R = \{P(a,b) \mid P(a,b)$ or $P^{-}(b,a) \in \mathcal{A}\}$. A *concept profile* of a in $\mathcal{A}$, denoted by $\Sigma_C(a)$, defined as follows: $\Sigma_C(a) = \bigcup_{D(a)\in\mathcal{A}}\{D\} \cup \bigcup_{P(a,b_1),\ldots,P(a,b_n)\in\mathcal{A}_R}\{\geq mP \mid m \in \Sigma_N, m \leq n\} \cup \bigcup_{P(b_1,a),\ldots,P(b_n,a)\in\mathcal{A}_R}\{\geq mP^{-} \mid m \in \Sigma_N, m \leq n\}$.

Intuitively speaking, a set of concept profiles is a partition of concepts occurring in an ABox w.r.t. individuals. For instance, let $\Sigma = \{C, D, P, a, b_1, b_2, 1, 2\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{C \sqcap D(a), P(a,b_1), P(a,b_2), D(b_1)\}$. Thus $\Sigma_C(a) = \{C \sqcap D, \exists P, \geq 2P\}$, $\Sigma_C(b_1) = \{D, \exists P^{-}\}$ and $\Sigma_C(b_2) = \{\exists P^{-}\}$.

Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ be a KB. We extend the signature $Sig(\mathcal{K})$ of $\mathcal{K}$ as $Sig^*(\mathcal{K}) = Sig(\mathcal{T}) \cup Sig(\varSigma_C(\mathcal{A}))$ where $\varSigma_C(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcup_{a \in N_A} \varSigma_C(a)$. Indeed, $Sig^*(\mathcal{K})$ is obtained from $Sig(\mathcal{K})$ by adding all possible natural numbers occurring all concept profiles but not occurring $\mathcal{K}$. In other words, $Sig^*(\mathcal{K})$ and $Sig(\mathcal{K})$ are no different except $\varSigma_N$. In the above example, $Sig(\mathcal{A}) = \{C, D, P, a, b_1, b_2\}$ while $Sig^*(\mathcal{A}) = \{C, D, P, a, b_1, b_2, 1, 2\}$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\varSigma = Sig^*(\mathcal{K})$ in the remain of this paper, unless otherwise stated.

Next, we will define the notion of minimal model features.

Definition 4 (Minimal Model Feature) *Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ be a KB. Denote $\varPi_\varSigma(a) = \{T_\varSigma(D) \mid D \in \varSigma_C(a)\}$. Given d and f, a df-*minimal model feature *of $\mathcal{K}$ is a feature $\mathcal{F} = \langle \varXi, \mathcal{H} \rangle$ satisfying the following three conditions:*

- *$\varXi \subseteq \varLambda^+_{d,f}(\varPi_\varSigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\varSigma)$;*
- *for each $P \in \varSigma_R$, $\exists P \in \cup\varXi$ iff $\exists P^- \in \cup\varXi$;*
- *$\tau \in \varLambda^+_{d,f}(\varPi_\varSigma(a), \varLambda^+_{d,f}(\varPi_\varSigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\varSigma)) \cap \varXi$ for each $a \in \varSigma_I$ and $\tau(a) \in \mathcal{H}$;*
- *for any $P(a,b) \in \mathcal{A}_R - \mathcal{H}$, either $\geq n+1 P(a) \notin \mathcal{H}$ and $P(a,b_1), \ldots, P(a,b_n) \in \mathcal{H}$, or $\geq n+1 P^-(b) \notin \mathcal{H}$ and $P(a_1,b), \ldots, P(a_n,b) \in \mathcal{H}$.*

$Mod^F_{d,f}(\mathcal{K})$ is the set of df-minimal model features of $\mathcal{K}$.

In the above definition, a minimal model feature is a feature $\mathcal{F}$ which contains two parts, namely, type set $\varXi$ and Herbrand set $\mathcal{H}$. The first condition requires that all types of $\varXi$ be minimal; the second says that $\varXi$ should be a model type set, i.e., it satisfies the property of role coherence; the third guarantees that each type of $\varXi$ satisfying each concept assertion in $\mathcal{H}$ has the minimal distance to its corresponding concept profile, that is, if a concept assertion $D(a)$ satisfied by $\mathcal{H}$ then types satisfying D are minimal w.r.t. type group $\varPi_\varSigma(a)$ of concept profile $\varSigma_C(a)$; and the last ensures that $\mathcal{F}$ is consistent by those role assertions conflicting with concept assertions.

Example 4 *In Penguin KB, we abbreviate $Penguin$ to P, $Swallow$ to S, $Bird$ to B, Fly to F, $tweety$ to t and $fred$ to r. Thus $\varSigma = \{P, S, B, F, t, r\}$, $\varSigma_C(t) = \{P, \neg F\}$ and $\varSigma_C(r) = \{S\}$. Assume that d is the Hamming distance and f is the aggregation function. We have $\varLambda^+_{d,f}(\varPi_\varSigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\varSigma) = \{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_4, \tau_8, \tau_{12}, \tau_{16}\}$, shown in the following table.*

Type	d_1	d_2	d_3	d_4	d_5
$\tau_1 = \{\}$	*1*	*0*	*1*	*1*	*1*
$\tau_2 = \{F\}$	*1*	*1*	*2*	*1*	*1*
$\tau_4 = \{B, F\}$	*1*	*1*	*2*	*1*	*1*
$\tau_8 = \{S, B, F\}$	*1*	*1*	*2*	*0*	*0*
$\tau_{12} = \{P, B, F\}$	*0*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*1*
$\tau_{16} = \{P, S, B, F\}$	*0*	*1*	*1*	*0*	*0*

Here $d_1 = d(\tau, T_\varSigma(P))$, $d_2 = d(\tau, T_\varSigma(\neg F))$, $d_3 = \lambda_{d,f}(\tau, \varPi_\varSigma(t))$, $d_4 = d(\tau, T_\varSigma(S))$ and $d_5 = \lambda_{d,f}(\tau, \varPi_\varSigma(r))$. From the above table, it concludes that $\varLambda^+_{d,f}(\varPi_\varSigma(a), \varLambda^+_{d,f}(\varPi_\varSigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\varSigma))$ = $\{\tau_1, \tau_{12}, \tau_{16}\}$ and $\varLambda^+_{d,f}(\varPi_\varSigma(r), \varLambda^+_{d,f}(\varPi_\varSigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\varSigma))$ = $\{\tau_8, \tau_{16}\}$. Thus, $Mod^F_{d,f}(\mathcal{K}) = \{\langle \varXi, \tau(t) \cup \tau'(r) \rangle \mid \tau \in \{\tau_1, \tau_{12}, \tau_{16}\}, \tau' \in \{\tau_8, \tau_{16}\}, \{\tau, \tau'\} \subseteq \varXi$ and $\varXi \subseteq \{\tau_1, \tau_8, \tau_{12}, \tau_{16}\}\}$.

We find that minimal model features can reach our aim.

Proposition 3 *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a KB. For any d and f, we have*

- $Mod^F_{d,f}(\mathcal{K}) \neq \emptyset$*;*
- $Mod^F_{d,f}(\mathcal{K}) = Mod^F(\mathcal{K})$*, if $\mathcal{K}$ is consistent.*

The intuition behind Proposition 3 is that the minimal model features of a KB are features closet to it's classical semantics. Remember that, while an inconsistent KB does not have any model feature, each KB has at least one minimal model feature. An expected result is that the second statement of Proposition 3 does not necessarily hold if $\mathcal{K}$ is inconsistent. For instance, in Example 3, $Mod^F_{d,f}(\mathcal{K}) = \{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2\}$ where $\mathcal{F}_1 = \langle\{\exists P\}, \{\exists P(a)\}\rangle$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 = \langle\{\exists P, \exists P^-\}, \{\exists P(a), \exists P^-(a)\}\rangle$ while $Mod^F(\mathcal{K}) = \emptyset$.

Now, based on minimal model features, we are ready to define the *distance-based entailment* for KBs, written $\models_{d,f}$, under which meaningful information can be entailed from an inconsistent KB.

Definition 5 (KB Distance-based Entailment) *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a KB and ϕ an axiom. Assume $\Sigma = Sig^*(\mathcal{K} \cup \{\phi\})$ be a signature. Given d and f, $\mathcal{K}$ distance-based entails (d-entails) ϕ, still denoted by $\mathcal{K} \models_{d,f} \phi$, if $Mod^F_{d,f}(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq Mod^F(\{\phi\})$.*

Distance-based entailment brings a new semantics (called *distance-based semantics*) for inconsistent KBs by weakening classical entailment. It is not hard to see that no contradiction can be entailed in this semantics. For instance, in Penguin KB, $\neg Fly \sqcap Fly(tweety)$ can not entailed but $\neg Fly \sqcup Fly(tweety)$ can under this semantics.

In the rest of this section, we exemplify that distance-based semantics is suitable for reasoning with inconsistent KBs.

Consequences are intuitive and reasonable under the distance-based semantics. In *Penguin KB*, $\mathcal{K} \models_{d^H,f^s} Fly(fred)$ while $\mathcal{K} \not\models_{d^H,f^s} Penguin(tweety)$ and $\mathcal{K} \not\models_{d^H,f^s} Fly(tweety)$. We further analyze those conclusions under distance-based semantics. The inconsistency of $\mathcal{K}$ is caused by statement about $tweety$. On the one hand, $tweety$ is a *penguin* which can not *fly*, i.e., $\neg Fly(tweety)$. On the other hand, *penguin* is a *bird* which can *fly*, i.e., $Fly(tweety)$. Moreover, there exists no more argument for either $Penguin(tweety)$ or $Fly(tweety)$. In this sense, neither $Penguin(tweety)$ nor $Fly(tweety)$ can be entailed under distance-based semantics. However, the statement about $fred$ in $\mathcal{K}$ contains no conflict. Thus $Fly(fred)$ can be entailed under distance-based semantics.

Furthermore, distance-based semantics also embodies the idea of "*majority vote consideration*" (see [14]), that is, conclusions must hold more argument for them, for resolving contradictions so that the results are more stable. For instance,

Example 5 *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a KB $(\{A \sqsubseteq B\}, \{A(a), B(a), \neg B(a)\})$. Thus $\Sigma = Sig^*(\mathcal{K}) = \{A, B, a\}$ and $\Sigma_C(a) = \{A, B, \neg B\}$. Then $\Lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\Pi_\Sigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma) = \{\{\neg A, \neg B\}, \{A, \neg B\}, \{A, B\}\}$. $Mod^F_{d^H,f^s}(\mathcal{K}) = \{\langle \Xi, \tau(a)\rangle \mid \Xi \subseteq \Lambda_{d^H,f^s}(\Pi_\Sigma(\mathcal{T}), T_\Sigma)$ and $\tau \in \Xi\}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{K}$ can d-entails $A(a)$, $B(a)$ and $A \sqsubseteq B$ except for $\neg B(a)$. Intuitively, compared with $\neg B(a)$, there is an extra argument $\{A(a), A \sqsubseteq B\}$ for $B(a)$.*

5 Properties of Distance-based Semantics

In general, our distance-based semantics can be taken as a framework in which many logical consequences are defined by selecting various distances and aggregation functions. In this section, we enumerate several good properties of distance-based semantics and several interesting relationships among them.

If $\mathcal{K}$ is inconsistent and there exists an axiom ϕ such that $\mathcal{K} \not\models_p \phi$ where $\models_p$ is an entailment relation, then we say $\models_p$ is *paraconsistent*. It is well known that classical entailment $\models$ is not paraconsistent.

Proposition 4 (Paraconsistency) *For any d and f, $\models_{d,f}$ is paraconsistent.*

To show the paraconsistency of the distance-based entailment, consider Example 3 and we have $\mathcal{K} \models_{d^H,f^s} \exists P^- \sqsubseteq \bot$ while $\mathcal{K} \not\models_{d^H,f^s} \exists P(a)$.

Most existing semantics for paraconsistent reasoning in DLs are much weaker than the classical semantics in this sense that there exists a consistent KB $\mathcal{K}$ and an axiom ϕ such that $\mathcal{K} \models \phi$ (also called *consistency preservation*) but ϕ is not entailed by $\mathcal{K}$ under the paraconsistent semantics. The following result shows that the distance-based semantics does not have such shortcoming.

Proposition 5 (Consistency Preservation) *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a KB and ϕ an axiom. For any d and f, if $\mathcal{K}$ is consistent, then $\mathcal{K} \models_{d,f} \phi$ iff $\mathcal{K} \models \phi$.*

In classical semantics, a property that $\mathcal{K} \models \psi$ iff $\mathcal{T} \models \psi$ for any inclusion ψ is called *TBox-preservation* where the problem of subsumption checking is irrelevant to ABoxes. Our distance-based semantics satisfies such a property.

Proposition 6 (TBox Preservation) *Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ be a KB and ψ an inclusion. For any d and f, $\mathcal{K} \models_{d,f} \psi$ iff $\mathcal{T} \models_{d,f} \psi$.*

The closure w.r.t. $\models_{d,f}$ of an arbitrary KB is always consistent.

Proposition 7 (Closure Consistency) *Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ be a KB. For any d and f, let*

- $Cn_{d,f}(\mathcal{T}) = \{\psi$ *is an inclusion* $\mid \mathcal{T} \models_{d,f} \psi\}$;
- $Cn^{\mathcal{T}}_{d,f}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\varphi$ *is an assertion* $\mid (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}) \models_{d,f} \varphi\}$.

We have both $Cn_{d,f}(\mathcal{T})$ and $Cn^{\mathcal{T}}_{d,f}(\mathcal{A})$ are consistent.

Let Σ be a signature. A distance d is *Σ-unbiased*, if for any Σ-concept C and any two Σ-types τ_1, τ_2 so that $A \in \tau_1$ iff $A \in \tau_2$ for any concept name A occurring in C then $d(\tau_1, T_\Sigma(C)) = d(\tau_2, T_\Sigma(C))$. Unbiasedness will bring a good property of relevance in reasoning.

Proposition 8 (Relevance) *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a KB, ϕ a non-tautological axiom and $\Sigma = Sig^*(\mathcal{K} \cup \{\phi\})$ a signature. If d is unbiased and $Sig(\mathcal{K}) \cap Sig(\{\phi\}) = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{K} \not\models_{d,f} \phi$ for any f.*

An entailment relation $\models_m$ is *monotonic* if $\mathcal{K}' \models_m \phi$ implies $\mathcal{K} \models_m \phi$ for any $\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}$; *nonmonotonic* otherwise. Another characteristic property of $\models_{d,f}$ is its non-monotonic nature.

Proposition 9 (Non-monotonicity) *For any d and f, $\models_{d,f}$ is non-monotonic.*

While the distance-based semantics is non-monotonic in general, it possesses a kind of cautious monotonicity, which is usually referred to as *splitting property*.

For instance, let $\mathcal{K} = (\{\top \sqsubseteq A, A \sqsubseteq \exists P, \exists P \sqsubseteq \bot, \exists P_1 \sqsubseteq \exists P_2\}, \{A(a), \exists P_1(b)\})$ be a KB, $\mathcal{K}$ can be split into $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2$ where $\mathcal{K}_1 = (\{\exists P_1 \sqsubseteq \exists P_2\}, \{\exists P_1(b)\})$ and $\mathcal{K}_2 = (\{\top \sqsubseteq A, A \sqsubseteq \exists P, \exists P \sqsubseteq \bot\}, \{A(a)\})$. Then, let $\phi = P_2(b)$, the problem of deciding $\mathcal{K} \models_{d,f} \phi$ can be reduced to checking whether $\mathcal{K}_1 \models_{d,f} \phi$. Notice that $\mathcal{K}_1$ is consistent and $Sig(\mathcal{K}_1) \cap Sig(\mathcal{K}_2) = \emptyset$. For some non-monotonic semantics, these two conditions are sufficient to guarantee the validity of the splitting property. However, it is not the case when $\mathcal{K}_1$ contains more than one axiom. For this reason, we need *hereditary aggregation functions* to really guarantee the validity of the splitting property (see [14]).

We say $\mathcal{K}$ is split into $\mathcal{K}'$ and $\mathcal{K}''$, denoted $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}' \oplus \mathcal{K}''$, if (1) $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}' \cup \mathcal{K}''$, and (2) $Sig(\mathcal{K}') \cap Sig(\mathcal{K}'') = \emptyset$.

An aggregation function f is *hereditary* iff $f(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) < f(\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\})$ implies for any $z_1, \ldots, z_m$, $f(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n, z_1, \ldots, z_m\}) < f(\{y_1, \ldots, y_n, z_1, \ldots, z_m\})$. For instance, the summation function is hereditary.

Proposition 10 (Splitting Property) *Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}' \oplus \mathcal{K}''$ where $\mathcal{K}'$ is consistent. If $\mathcal{K}' \models \phi$ then for any hereditary aggregation function f and d, $\mathcal{K} \models_{d,f} \phi$ for each axiom ϕ such that $Sig(\phi) \cap Sig(\mathcal{K}'') = \emptyset$.*

One advantage of the splitting property is that the paraconsistent reasoning in KB $\mathcal{K}$ can be localized into the classical reasoning in a consistent module of $\mathcal{K}$, which is usually smaller than the original $\mathcal{K}$. Such a property can be very useful for a highly distributed ontology system.

A relation $|\!\approx$ is *cautious* if it satisfies:

- (*cautious reflexivity*) if $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}' \oplus \mathcal{K}''$ and $\mathcal{K}'$ is consistent, then $\mathcal{K}|\!\approx\varphi$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}'$;
- (*cautious monotonicity*) if $\mathcal{K}|\!\approx\varphi$ and $\mathcal{K}|\!\approx\psi$, then $\mathcal{K} \cup \{\varphi\}|\!\approx\psi$;
- (*cautious cut*) if $\mathcal{K}|\!\approx\varphi$ and $\mathcal{K} \cup \{\varphi\}|\!\approx\psi$ then $\mathcal{K}|\!\approx\psi$.

Proposition 11 (Cautious Relation) *For any d and monotonic hereditary aggregation function f, $\models_{d,f}$ is cautious.*

Proposition 12 *Let $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ be a KB, ϕ an axiom and $\Sigma = Sig^*(\mathcal{K} \cup \{\phi\})$ a signature. For any f, if $\mathcal{K} \models_{d^D,f} \phi$ then $\mathcal{K} \models_{d^H,f} \phi$.*

In Proposition 12, the converse does not hold.

Example 6 *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A(a), \neg A \sqcap \exists P(a), \neg \exists P(a)\}$ be an inconsistent ABox. Thus $\mathcal{A} \models_{d^H,f^m} \neg A \sqcup \exists P(a)$ while $\mathcal{A} \not\models_{d^D,f^m} \neg A \sqcup \exists P(a)$.*

In general, different result for a KB would be brought by selecting different distance and aggregation. For instance, in Example 3, $\mathcal{A} \models_{d^H, f^{\frac{1}{2}}} A(a)$ while $\mathcal{A} \not\models_{d^H, f^s} A(a)$.

The next result shows that for κ-voting functions, the greater κ is, the stronger the power of distance-based entailment is.

Proposition 13 (κ-voting Monotonicity) *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a KB and ϕ an axiom. Assume $\Sigma = Sig^*(\mathcal{K} \cup \{\phi\})$ is a signature. For any two voting indexes $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in (0, 1)$ and any d, if $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$ then $\mathcal{K} \models_{d, f^{\kappa_1}} \phi$ implies $\mathcal{K} \models_{d, f^{\kappa_2}} \phi$.*

6 Related Works

In this section, we compare our scenario with existing paraconsistent approaches in DL-Lite or other DLs.

Existing model-centered approaches for inconsistency handling are usually based on sorts of extended inconsistency tolerable semantics, such as four-valued description logics by [18] and quasi-classical description logics by [12]. Compared to them, our distance-based semantics works on classical interpretations but still can draw more useful and reasonable logical consequences. For example, under four-vaued DL-Lite, modus ponens, modus tollens and disjunctive syllogism are no longer hold. Taking the Penguin KB for example, we can not drive the intuitive conclusions that the swallow fred is a bird and can fly under the four-valued semantics (with the material inclusion interpretation [18]). Contrarily, quasi-classical DLs can satisfy basic reasoning rules mentioned above. However, they might bring too much contradictory consequences. Considering again the Penguin KB, all assertions about tweety become contradictory under the quasi-classical semantics. Moreover, these approaches do not provide a mechanism of comparing different models for a KB and are usually monotonic such that they do not hold consistency-preserving. And above all, our scenario provides a framework which is feasibly extended in a natural way to multiple-valued semantics so that multiple-valued logics can be incorporated.

Different from model-based approaches, syntax-based paraconsistent approaches taking some consistent subsets as substitutes of KBs in reasoning, such as [7,8]. Similarly to our approach, those syntax-based paraconsistent semantics can satisfy several properties that do not hold in multi-valued semantics, such as non-monotonicity, consistency-preserving and splitting property. But they differ from ours in the following aspects. Firstly, they do not satisfy the closure consistency. Secondly, those syntax-based approaches focus on local information so that they could difficultly capture the semantics of whole a KB. Finally, they might bring the multi-extension problem because of limitations of their selection mechanisms.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a model-based framework to handle inconsistency in DL-Lite by introducing distances over types of features for KBs. Within this framework, we defined a kind of semantics (called distance-based semantics) which characterize a kind of cautious entailment relations that are paraconsistent, non-monotonic and hold the splitting property. A characteristic property of distance-based entailments is that they retain consistency to a large extent. Furthermore, our model-based framework gives consideration to both semantic minimal change and the rule of "majority vote consideration" in syntax. In this sense, our approach is a natural combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. As a result, our scenario is a more fine-grained compared to previous approaches to paraconsistent reasoning. Though distance-based semantics presented in this paper is built on classical semantics (two-valued semantics), we can also define distance-based semantics on multi-valued semantics within our framework.

The definition of the distance-based entailment relation actually provides an algorithm for paraconsistent reasoning in DL-Lite for general distances. It would be useful to develop efficient algorithms and implement them in the future. In addition, [18] propose a distance-based approach to measure inconsistency of TBoxes. However, this approach might be difficult to do so because of infinity of models of DL KBs. As a future work, we employ our distance-based technique to measure inconsistency of KBs.

References

1. Artale, A., Calvanese, D., Kontchakov, R., Zakharyaschev, M.: The dl-lite family and relations. J. Artif. Intell. Res. (JAIR) **36** (2009) 1–69
2. Kalyanpur, A., Parsia, B., Sirin, E., Grau, B.C.: Repairing unsatisfiable concepts in OWL ontologies. In: Proc. of ESWC'06, Montenegro. LNCS 4011, Springer (2006) 170–184
3. Meyer, T.A., Lee, K., Booth, R., Pan, J.Z.: Finding maximally satisfiable terminologies for the description logic ALC. In: Proc. of AAAI'06, USA, AAAI Press (2006)
4. Dolby, J., Fan, J., Fokoue, A., Kalyanpur, A., Kershenbaum, A., Ma, L., Murdock, J.W., Srinivas, K., Welty, C.A.: Scalable cleanup of information extraction data using ontologies. In: Proc. of ISWC/ASWC'07, Korea. LNCS 4825, Springer (2007) 100–113
5. Du, J., Shen, Y.D.: Computing minimum cost diagnoses to repair populated DL-based ontologies. In: Proc. of WWW'08, China, ACM (2008) 565–574
6. Gao, S., Qi, G., Wang, H.: A new operator for abox revision in DL-Lite. In: Proc. of AAAI'12, Canada, AAAI Press (2012)
7. Schlobach, S., Cornet, R.: Non-standard reasoning services for the debugging of description logic terminologies. In: Proc.of IJCAI'03, Mexico, Morgan Kaufmann (2003) 355–362
8. Huang, Z., van Harmelen, F., ten Teije, A.: Reasoning with inconsistent ontologies. In: Proc. of IJCAI'05, UK, Professional Book Center (2005) 454–459
9. Lembo, D., Lenzerini, M., Rosati, R., Ruzzi, M., Savo, D.F.: Query rewriting for inconsistent dl-lite ontologies. In: Proc. of RR'11, Ireland. LNCS 6902, Springer (2011) 155–169
10. Zhang, X., Lin, Z.: An argumentation framework for description logic ontology reasoning and management. J. Intell. Inf. Syst. DOI:10.1007/s10844-012-0230-7. (2012)
11. Ma, Y., Hitzler, P.: Paraconsistent reasoning for OWL 2. In: Proc. of RR'09, USA. Volume 5837 of LNCS 5837., Springer (2009) 197–211
12. Zhang, X., Xiao, G., Lin, Z.: A tableau algorithm for handling inconsistency in OWL. In: Proc. of ESWC'09, Greece. LNCS 5554, Springer (2009) 399–413
13. Zhang, X., Lin, Z.: Quasi-classical description logic. Multiple-Valued Logic and Soft Computing **18**(3-4) (2012) 291–327
14. Arieli, O.: Distance-based paraconsistent logics. Int. J. Approx. Reasoning **48**(3) (2008) 766–783

15. Wang, Z., Wang, K., Topor, R.W.: A new approach to knowledge base revision in DL-Lite. In: Proc. of AAAI'10, USA, AAAI Press (2010) 369–374
16. Kontchakov, R., Wolter, F., Zakharyaschev, M.: Can you tell the difference between DL-Lite ontologies? In: Proc. of KR'08, Australia, AAAI Press (2008) 285–295
17. Calvanese, D., Giacomo, G.D., Lembo, D., Lenzerini, M., Rosati, R.: Tractable reasoning and efficient query answering in description logics: The DL-Lite family. J. Autom. Reasoning **39**(3) (2007) 385–429
18. Ma, Y., Hitzler, P.: Distance-based measures of inconsistency and incoherency for description logics. In: Proc. of DL'10, Canada. CEUR Workshop Proceedings 573, CEUR-WS.org (2010)